

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

BER	ZONING ER	GENERA PLAN	COUNCIL DISTRICT		
A FILE NUMB	<u>. </u>			BY	
			ETED BY APPLIC PRINT OR TYPE)	CANT	
OFPROPER	TYBEING	La T	in China	Ab Office	9500
R'S PARCELI	NUMBER(S)	412-	37-00	> 7	
FPROTEST		 .			
t the propose	ed rezoning be	ecause See Atta	CHIICHI A		
		lee constat	e sheet if necessary		··
perty in which	h I own an un	divided interest of a	t least 51%, and on b	ehalf of which this pro	test is being filed
ted at: <i>(desc</i>	ribe propertv	bv address and As	ssessors Parcei Nu	mper)	
3 (smbr	your Dr	- Comp	bell, CA	· 1200
AP	N: N	412-3	7-00	<u> </u>	
			<u> </u>		
now zoned	R1-8		District. (in S	anta Clara Count	y)
			SOUPER IT THE SECTION	www	
X Fee Inte	erest (ownersh	ip)			
Leaseh	old interest w	hich expires on			
Other:	(explain)				
—	• •				
	DEPROTEST St the propose Deperty in which ted at: (desc) A P now zoned divided intered Leaseh	DEPROTEST St the proposed rezoning be operty in which I own an united at: (describe property) APA : now zoned R1-8 Idivided interest which I own Easehold interest was a compared to the property in the property in which I own an united at: (describe property) APA : Leasehold interest was a compared in the compa	Use separate the proposed rezoning because See Atta Use separate operty in which I own an undivided interest of a sted at: (describe property by address and Astronomy See Atta Dr. Application of the property of the propert	DEPROTEST Set the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary operty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on buted at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number of APN : 412 - 37 - 00000000000000000000000000000000	DEPROTEST Set the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary Departy in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) District. (In Santa Clara County address which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership)

PRINTNAME Lida V. ISSako	DAYTIME (A: TELEPHONE#	372.	1851
803 Cambriou Dr. Campbe	el, c	TATE C	ZIPCODE 355068
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	,	DATE 2	7,2010
PRINTNAME Youtan Issalo	DAYTIME () TELEPHONE#	408>	.1851
ADDRESS 803 Cambrian Dr. Camp	Sell &	TATE	SIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) 1850/50		DATE	27.201C
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	,	DATE	
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
Use separate sheet if necessary	7		

STATE OF CALIFOR	RNIA)		
COUNTY OF San	rta Clard) ss)		
acknowledged to me that by his/her/their	before me, May tyoutan Issake to be the person(s) whose ne that Ke/ske/they executed the signature(s) on the instrument.	he same in ly/s/	het/their authorized	capacity(ies), and
paragraph is true an	IALTY OF PERJURY under d correct. by hand and official seal. ary Public	the laws of the	MARI/ COMM. Notary Put	# 1813285 Notes Sep. 16, 2012
STATE OF CALIFOR)) ss)		
acknowledged to me that by his/her/their	before me,	name(s) is/are s he same in his,	, who proved to m subscribed to the with her/their authorized	nin instrument and capacity(ies), and
I certify under PEN paragraph is true ar	JALTY OF PERJURY under ad correct.	the laws of t	he State of Californi	a that the foregoing
WITNESS n	ny hand and official seal.			
	ary Public		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	то ві	E COMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	I	DATE
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER			BY
			TED BY APPLICANT RINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED		male UUR:	RT INAN CAM	PBALL, CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	.140WDER(5)	30 V Fa. F1 VI V	Mary Strong	1 DINCE IN OUG
REASON OF PROTEST	ļ	Saa Attach	A	
I protest the propos	ed rezoning becaus	30 See Auacii	ment A	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		Use separate s	sheet if necessary	
The property in which is situated at: (desc	ch I own an undivideribe property by a	ed interest of at le	east 51%, and on behalf of versions of versions of the second of the sec	which this protest is being filed,
960	Stonenu	irst wa	y, Campbell	CA 95008
	2-40-01			
and is now zoned			District. (in Santa Cl	lara County)
The undivided intere	est which I own in th	ne property descri	ibed in the statement above	e is a:
FeeInte	erest (ownership)			•
Leaseh	nold interest which e	expires on		
<u>,</u>		·		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF Santa Uara) ss.)	
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose na acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	Notary Public, personally appeared to me on the basis of ame(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and e same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and at the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the	d
	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing	, 1
paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and official seal.	L. BASILE Commission # 18 Notary Public - Ca Santa Clara Cou My Comm. Expires Ma	lifornia unty
Notary Public	(Seal)	
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.	
COUNTI OF)	
	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of	đ
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	me(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and e same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and at the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the paragraph is true and correct.	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing	
WITNESS my hand and official seal.		
Natary Public	(Seal)	
NOTOTA MINIO		

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO	BE COMPLETED I	BY PLANNING	STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
REZONING FILI	ENUMBER			BY	
		O BE COMPLETE (PLEASE PRI)	NT OR TYPE)		
ADDRESS OF P PROTESTED	ROPERTYBEING 9	10 stonehu	VIT W	ay Camp bell (AG	500
ASSESSOR'S PA	ARCELNUMBER(S)	112-40	-017-	00	
REASON OF PR				V	
l protest the p	proposed rezoning bed	ause See Attachm	nent A		-
		Use separate she			
is situated at	: (describe property b	y address and Asses:	st 51%, and on be so <mark>r's <i>Parcel Num</i></mark>	half of which this protest is being filed, ber)	
9.70	Stonehur	st Way			_
Cam	phell, CA				-
41	2-40-0	717-00			_
and is now a	zoned R1-8		_ District. (in Sar	nta Clara County)	
The undivide	d interest which I own i	n the property describe	ed in the statemer	it above is a:	
	Fee Interest (ownership)			
	Leasehold interest whi	ch expires on			
	Other: (explain)				_
					-
					_

PRINTNAME Gary Mantala	ź	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-	993-1282
ADDRESS 970 StoNehurst	Campbel	S	IATE C	ZIP CODE
PRINTNAME Gary Mantalas ADDRESS D Stonehurst SIGNATURE (Notarized) Amy Mantalas PRINTNAME ADDRESS	0-2		DATE (-22-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	FATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		-	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	·	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE .	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	***
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	<u>~</u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate	sheet if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF SAMTA CLAMA	<u>, </u>) s)	s.
satisfactory evidence-to be the per acknowledged to me that he/she/t	rson(s) whose nar they executed the on the instrument	me(s)/15/are same in/his	, Notary Public, personally appeared , who proved to me on the basis of subscribed to the within instrument and her/their authorized capacity(ies), and (s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PI paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and o		he laws of	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. ExpresMcy22,2012
Notary Public			(Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF	_)) ss)	3.
satisfactory evidence-to be the per acknowledged to me that he/she/t that by his/her/their signature(s) o person(s) acted, executed the instr	son(s) whose nan hey executed the on the instrument rument.	ne(s) is/are s same in his, the person(, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of subscribed to the within instrument and /her/their authorized capacity(ies), and s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PE paragraph is true and correct.	IRJURY under th	ne laws of t	he State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and o	fficial seal.		
Notary Public			(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

		TO.	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNIN	G STAFF
	FILENUMBER		COUNCIL	DATE
	QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY
-	REZONING FIL	ENUMBER		
		100 mg/m	O BE COMPLETED BY APPL (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
K.	ADDRESS OF I PROTESTED	PROPERTY BEING	034 SHAMRO	CK DR.
*	414.	PARCELNUMBER(S) -0/~065		
	REASONOFPI	ROTEST		
	I protest the	proposed rezoning bec	ause See Attachment A	

			Use separate sheet if necessary	
\ &^*	The propert	it: (describe property b	vided interest of at least 51%, and on y address and Assessor's Parcel N	
*	1034	· / ``t	λ	
	and is now	zoned R1-8	District. (in S	Santa Clara County)
\ <i>E</i>	The undivid	ed interest which I own i	n the property described in the stater	nent above is a:
X		Fee Interest (ownership)	
		Leasehold interest which	ch expires on	
		Other: (explain)		
-				

PRINTNAME CEORGE SAMPALIK		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 1034 SHAMROCK DR	CITY (A	npBECC ST	TATE CA	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATES . 2	5.7010
PRINTNAME #		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S.	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	-		DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet	if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
county of Santa Clara) ss.)
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the	Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and he same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under paragraph is true and correct.	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. (Lexe of Notary Public	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californi Santa Clara County My Comm. Express Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.)
satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose na acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed th	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of ame(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ne same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and nt the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
•	the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

are so a reservice de la secolo dela secolo de la secolo dela secolo de la secolo dela secolo dela secolo dela secolo de la secolo de la secolo de la secolo dela secolo d	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF			
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY		
REZONING FILE NUME	3ER					
			ED BY APPLICANT RINT OR TYPE)			
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	RTYBEING 056 N	JORMA	INDY DR CA	MPBELL, CA 95008		
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	1 11 11 15 ED (O)	02064				
REASON OF PROTES I protest the propos		-w-				
			sheet if necessary			
المحالات المحالمات المحالم	ariba aranartu bu sidra	see and Acc	essors Parcel Numberi	which this protest is being filed,		
1056 NOI 41402	MANDY DA	, CAMI	PBZIC, CA 9500	<i>y</i> *		
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Cla	ara County)		
The undivided inte	rest which I own in the pr	operty desc	oribed in the statement above	is a:		
X FeeIn	iterest (ownership)					
Lease	ehold interest which expl	res on				
Other	Other: (explain)					

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.
On Series Defore me, Mens Motary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Santa Clara ss.
On 9/21/2010 before me, Mana Peyn Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(jes), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. WE Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Sep. 16, 2012 (Seal)

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	John John John John John John John John	DATE
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER	PLAIV		BY
			ED BY APPLICANT	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED /// //	RTYBEING COTH G M	FUBOZ	10 CANON.	940 Sweetbran
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	All IMPEDIO	124		
REASON OF PROTEST	ed rezoning because _S	See Attach	ment A	
	Us	se separate s	sheet if necessary	
is situated at: (desc	ch I own an undivided in cribe property by addre	terest of at less and Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of whesor's Parcel Number)	
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
Fee Int	erest (ownership) nold interest which expire	es on	ibed in the statement above i	s a:

PRINTNAME MARGOTH G. MENDO ADDRESS 940 SWEETBALAR DR	DZA			68-0003
ADDRESS 940 SWEETBRIAR DR	CITY	MPBELL S	TATE A	ZIP CODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Mayouth H-Ma	udora	northwest commercia	DATE ₉ /	22/2010
PRINTNAME	0	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>.</u>	•
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>.</u>	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	ŧ	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	£	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	£	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	et if necessar	y		***

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)		
COUNTY OF SANTA (CMA) ss.)		
satisfactory evidence-to be acknowledged to me that I	the person(s) whose restances the secuted the secured the secuted	name(s)/15/210 su he same in his/h	, Notary Public, personally app _, who proved to me on the basis of bscribed to the within instrument a er/their authorized capacity(ies), ar , or the entity upon behalf of which	ina nd
I certify under PENALTY paragraph is true and corr	ect.	the laws of the	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm.ExpresMay22, 2012	NNA1 6
Motary Pu	blic		(Seal)	
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)		
satisfactory evidence-to be acknowledged to me that I	the person(s) whose ine/she/they executed ture(s) on the instrume	name(s) is/are su the same in his/h	, Notary Public, personally app _, who proved to me on the basis of abscribed to the within instrument a her/their authorized capacity(ies), ar h, or the entity upon behalf of which	f and ad
I certify under PENALTY paragraph is true and corr		r the laws of th	e State of California that the foreg	going
WITNESS my han	d and official seal.			
Notary Pu	ıblic		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	T	O BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNIN	G STAFF		
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	<u></u>		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	T DIOTINO		DATE	i i
REZONING FILE N	IUMBER					
		TO BE COMPLET (PLEASE PI	TED BY APPL RINT OR TYPE)	LICANT		
ADDRESS OF PROPROTESTED	OPERTYBEING	879 SWEE	TBRIAR	DR.	CAMPBELL	9500
ASSESSOR'S PAR	RCELNUMBER(S)	412-40.	-031-	00		
REASON OF PRO		ecause See Attach	nment A			
		Use separate s	sheet if necessar	у		
The property in	n which I own an u	ndivided interest of at le	east 51%, and or	n behalf of wh	ich this protest is bei	ng filed,
		RINR DR			95008	8
		031-00	7			
						<u></u>
and is now zo	oned R1-8		District. (in	Santa Clar	a County)	
The undivided	interest which I ow	vn in the property desc	ribed in the state	ment above is	sa:	
∑ F	ee Interest (owners	hip)				
Le	easehold interest v	vhich expires on				
o	ther: (explain)					
				···-	<u></u>	

ADDRESS STY SWEETBOAR DETERMINE THE PHONE TO STATE TO SO THE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE TELEPHO					
ADDRESS STY SWEETBURY DETERMINENT STATE OF ORDER SIGNATURE (Notarized) Carlal R. Work TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE	PRINTNAME RANDAU R WHITE		TELEPHONE#	408-	377-6300
SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized)	ADDRESS 879 SWEETBRIAR DO	CITY CAMPB	EU. SI	CHO	75008
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	SIGNATURE (Notarized) 1/2 / / // // //	lul		DATE 9	22/2010
SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	PRINTNAME		TELEPHONE#		,
PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE	SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE DATE	PRINTNAME				
PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE # ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY DATE DATE DATE DATE DATE CITY DATE	PRINTNAME				
PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE DATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS DATE DATE	ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIPCODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE# DATE DATE DATE DATE DATE DATE	SIGNATURE (Notarized)		-	DATE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized) PRINT NAME DAYTIME TELEPHONE# ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	PRINTNAME				
PRINT NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP CODE SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized) DATE	PRINTNAME	<u> </u>			
Oldivation (Moterized)	ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
Use separate sheet if necessary	SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
	Use separate she	et if necessary	/		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Sensa Clara) ss.)
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed	who proved to me on the basis of name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under paragraph is true and correct.	er the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Cline M James Notary Public	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss
On before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared , who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed	name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under paragraph is true and correct.	er the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO I	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATEBY
REZONING FILE	NUMBER			- 01
		as to a grade the company of the company	ED BY APPLICANT INT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PI PROTESTED	ROPERTY BEING	- F. C. al. B.	SRIAR Dr	2 118
ASSESSOR'S PA	ARCELNUMBER(S)		JULIANE COL	
	2 41 00	sed		
REASONOFPR		Caa Attach	mant A	
I protest the p	proposed rezoning beca	iuse See Attacin	nent A	
		*		
The property	in which Lowe on undiv		neet if necessary	which this protest is being filed,
			ssor's Parcel Number)	Mich this protest is being filed,
899	15 WEE + 1	3 RIAR	Dr	
) d124			
and is now a	zoned R1-8		_ District. (in Santa Cla	ara County)
The undivide	d interest which I own in	the property describ	oed in the statement above	ols a:
\B	Fee Interest (ownership)			
	_easehold interest which	h expires on		
	Other: (explain)			
Ц ,	on fortening		I Albert	
				*
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME		
DEANDE H. BUSECKET				369-2004
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
894 SWEET BRIAR DR	('fun	BELL (-4-	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE /	1
Janne a Doskov			91	22/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME		
		TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME		
		TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME		
		TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate she	et if necessary	/		

STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA)		
COUNTY OF _	GANTA CLAMA)	SS.	
acknowledged to that by his/her/	o me that he/she/they execute	ed the same in	, Notary Public, personally appea , who proved to me on the basis of are subscribed to the within instrument and a his her their authorized capacity(ies), and son(s), or the entity upon behalf of which th	l.
I certify under paragraph is tru		der the laws	of the State of California that the foregoin M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411	ng
WITNES	SS my hand and official seal.		Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comn. Bores May 22, 2012	NNA1
<u> </u>	Notary Public		(Seal)	
STATE OF CAL	FORNIA)	ga.	
COUNTY OF)	ss.	
On	before me,		, Notary Public, personally appear , who proved to me on the basis of	red
acknowledged to that by his/her/tl	o me that he/she/they execute	d the same in	are subscribed to the within instrument and his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and son(s), or the entity upon behalf of which th	
I certify under l paragraph is tru	•	der the laws	of the State of California that the foregoing	ηg
WITNES	S my hand and official seal.			
	Notary Public		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Bullding and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL.	District	DATE
REZONING FILE NUM	BER	PLAN		BY
TICZONIIVAT IZETVOMI				
		THE TOTAL CONTRACTOR TO THE SECOND TO THE S	ED BY APPLICANT HINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED 90			h.	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL		plan	d.√.	
412-4-1	132			
REASONOF PROTEST		See Attach	ment A	
I protest the propos	ed rezoning because	300 ½ 1114011		
	U	se separate s	heet if necessary	
The property in whi	ch I own an undivided ir	iterest of at le	east 51%, and on behalf of whi	ch this protest is being filed,
	cribe property by addre well lucin L		essor's Parcel Number)	
	veenouor e	They -	1/2 / 00 5	
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clara	a County)
·				
.	·	operty descr	ibed in the statement above is	a:
FeeInt	erest (ownership)			
Lease	nold interest which expl	res on	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Other:	(explain)			

PRINTNAME RANDEE MCQUEEN		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 906 Sweetbrian Dr.	CITY Otmobel	ST	ATE Cl	ZIP CODE 757008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) M Queen			DATE 9/2	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	-
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		-	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use sepa	arate sheet if necessary			

	of california ry of <u>GMMA CUMM</u>)	SS.	
Onsatisfact acknow that by I	4	hose name(s)@ s/ a uted the same in	re-subscribed to the w his/her/their authoriz	ed capacity(ies), and
-	under PENALTY OF PERJURY oph is true and correct.	under the laws o	of the State of Califor	rnia that the foregoing
	WITNESS my hand and official sea	al.	(Seal)	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - Californi Santa Clara County My Comm. Expres May 22, 201
STATE	OF CALIFORNIA)	SS.	
COUNT	'Y OF)		•
satisfactorics acknowledge that by the satisfactorics acknowledge to the s	ory evidence-to be the person(s) wheledged to me that he/she/they executes/her/their signature(s) on the instances acted, executed the instrument.	nose name(s) is/a uted the same in	, who proved to re subscribed to the w his/her/their authorize	vithin instrument and ed capacity(ies), and
	under PENALTY OF PERJURY to the philippe and correct.	under the laws o	of the State of Califor	rnia that the foregoing
,	WITNESS my hand and official sea	ıl.		
	Notary Public	_	(Seal)	
	roung rubiic			

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	то	3E COMPLETED F	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NU	MBER			
	TO	D BE COMPLETE (PLEASE PRIN	ED BY APPLICANT NT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROF PROTESTED	PERTYBEING)35 Sha	imrock Dr.	Campbell 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARC	ELNUMBER(S)		POC	
REASON OF PROTE		use See Attachm	nent A	
		Use separate she	eet if necessary	
The property in v	vhich I own an undiv	ided interest of at least address and Asses	st 51%, and on behalf of whi sor's Parcel Number)	ch this protest is being filed,
	1035	Shamro		
		100 CA	<u> 95008</u> 01-004	
and is now zone	ed <u>R1-8</u>		_ District. (in Santa Clara	a County)
The undivided in	lerest which I own in	the property describe	ed in the statement above is	a:
Fee	Interest (ownership)			
Leas	sehold interest whic	h expires on		
Othe	er:(explain)			

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 	
PRINTNAME Elizabeth FESSLEV		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408.7	36.8300
ADDRESS 1035 Shamrock Dr	Campb	ell E	然 9 9	5005 5005
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Clashith (Like	rlev'		DATE 9/	22/10
PRINTNAME ROBERT FESSIEV		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408.7	36.8300
address 1035 Shandrock	Cample		TATE	95005
SIGNATUBE (Notarized)	BOSANISIA MARINIA MARI	_	DATÉ	2-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	ţ	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	-	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate s	sheet if necessary	/		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF <u>SAMA CLAN</u>	<u> </u>)) ss.)		
satisfactory evidence-to be the packnowledged to me that he/sh	person(s) whose nate/she/shever a the person (s) on the instrument	ame(s) is/ are sul ie same in his/he	, Notary Public, personally appeare, who proved to me on the basis of bscribed to the within instrument and er he authorized capacity (ies), and or the entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PENALTY OF paragraph is true and correct.	PERJURY under	the laws of the	State of California that the foregoing	g
WITNESS my hand and Motary Public	d official seal.	MAKA	Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Expres May 22, 2012 (Seal)	
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)	•	
Onb	efore me,		, Notary Public, personally appeare , who proved to me on the basis of	ed
acknowledged to me that he/sh	e/they executed the) on the instrumen	me(s) is/are sub e same in his/he	oscribed to the within instrument and er/their authorized capacity(ies), and or the entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PENALTY OF paragraph is true and correct.	PERJURY under	the laws of the	State of California that the foregoing	ŗ
WITNESS my hand and	l official seal.			
Notary Public			(Seal)	

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	3.74 TO I	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING S	TAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATEBY
REZONING FILE	NUMBER		BY
	TC	D BE COMPLETED BY APPLICA (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	NT
ADDRESS OF PROTESTED / ASSESSOR'S PA	OST SHAR RCELNUMBER(S)	IROCK DR. CAM	pBELL CAL.
REASONOFPRO	DTEST	See Attachment A	
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property is situated at:	in which I own an undiv	vided interest of at least 51%, and on behi	alf of which this protest is being filed, er)
I.		K OR.	
	1006		
and is now z	oned R1-8	District. (in Sant	ta Clara County)
The undivided	d interest which I own in	n the property described in the statement	above is a:
) X F	Fee Interest (ownership)	F	
□ L	easehold interest whic	ch expires on	
	Other: (explain)		

PRINTNAME		DAYTIME	- 27 (2)	
WATLE PATHNEY		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	377.6	,100
ADDRESS	CITY	ST MADELL	ATE	ZIPCODE 95009
1057 SHAMROCK DR.	6,3	mp DELL	<u> </u>	93 000
ADDRESS 1057 SHAMROCK PR. SIGNATURE (Notarized) Watio Contlines			DATE.	5+-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S1	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	et if necessary	7		

STATE OF CALIFOR	INIA)		
COUNTY OF SC	rfa Vora) ss.)	•	
acknowledged to me that by his/her/their s person(s) acted, exect	to be the person(s) whose not that he/she/they executed the signature(s) on the instrument the instrument. ALTY OF PERJURY under	Hance Subsection (s) is/are subsection (s) i	, Notary Public, personally app , who proved to me on the basis of oscribed to the within instrument a er/their authorized capacity(ies), ar or the entity upon behalf of which	and and the
Nias	whand and official seal. What is a seal of the seal o	VS/	Commi Notary F Santo	NE M. JAMES ssion # 1733376 public - California i Clara County n. Expires Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFOR	NIA)		
COUNTY OF) ss.)	•	
acknowledged to me t that by his/her/their s	to be the person(s) whose na that he/she/they executed the ignature(s) on the instrumen	me(s) is/are sub e same in his/he	, Notary Public, personally app , who proved to me on the basis of oscribed to the within instrument a cr/their authorized capacity(ies), an or the entity upon behalf of which	nd d
person(s) acted, execu I certify under PENA paragraph is true and	ALTY OF PERJURY under (he laws of the	State of California that the foreg	oing
WITNESS my	hand and official seal.			
			(Seal)	
Motar	ry Public			

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING	STAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY
REZONING FILE	NUMBER		
		TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLI (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PF	OPERTY BEING	mrock Dr	
ASSESSORS PA	KCELNOMBEK(2)		
BEASONOFPRO	1-2016 DTEST		
I protest the p	roposed rezoning be	ecause See Attachment A	
, protour ma p			
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
is situated at:	(describe property	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file
is situated at:	(describe property – S. Rann	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file
is situated at:	(describe property – S. Rann	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file umber)
is situated at:	(describe property	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file umber)
is situated at: / 0 K 2 - 4 L 4 -	(describe property Shaw 01-261	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file umber)
is situated at: / 0 K 2 - Uf 4 and is now :	coned R1-8	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No	behalf of which this protest is being file umber) Santa Clara County)
is situated at: / O K 7 Uf 4 and is now:	coned R1-8	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No Color District. (in Son in the property described in the stater	behalf of which this protest is being file umber) Santa Clara County)
is situated at: / O K 2 Uf 4- and is now: The undivide	coned R1-8 d interest which I own Leasehold interest w	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No Control Of	behalf of which this protest is being file umber) Santa Clara County) nent above is a:
is situated at: / O K 2 Uf 4- and is now: The undivide	coned R1-8 d interest which I own Leasehold interest w	divided interest of at least 51%, and on by address and Assessor's Parcel No.	behalf of which this protest is being file umber) Santa Clara County) nent above is a:

X

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

PRINTNAME J SMITH		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	
ADDRESS 1082 SHAMROCK	CITY /	mobell	STATE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		7	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	-
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	-
ADDRESS	CITY	<u> </u>	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	,
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE	#	
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate si	neet if necessa	ry		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.)
acknowledged to me that he/she/they execu	who proved to me on the basis of ose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and rument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY 1 paragraph is true and correct.	nder the laws of the State of California that the foregoing MICHELLE ANTONOWICZ Commission # 1851839
WITNESS my hand and official sea Muchille Quot Notary Public	Notary Public - Galifornia R
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.)
On before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared
acknowledged to me that he/she/they exect	ose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and ted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and rument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY paragraph is true and correct.	under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official sea	i.
	(Seal)
Notary Public	

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE CC	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER			
			ED BY APPLICANT NNT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED 100		ly Dr	Campbe/	1 CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S) 414	0201	52	
I protest the propos	red rezoning because	See Attach	ment A	
	U	se separate s	heet if necessary	
is situated at: (desc	cribe property by addre	ss and Asse	ssor's Parcel Number)	which this protest is being filed, 95008
Assessors	Parcel Kumb	er 4	1402062	
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa C	Clara County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in the pro	operty descr	bed in the statement abov	ve is a:
Fee Int	erest (ownership)			
Lease	nold interest which expire	es on		
Other:	(explain)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		

PRINTNAME Willard J Roit		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	4083	7/6256
ADDRESS 1068 Normandy Dr	CITY Campb	ell s	TATE CA	ZIP CODE 95-008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Willan Pert			DATE 9	122/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	:	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>.</u>	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate:	sheet if necessar	γ		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF GMA CLAM	<u> </u>) ss.)	
acknowledged to me that he/she/t	they executed the son the instrument t	ame in his/her/	_, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of cribed to the within instrument and (their authorized capacity(ies), and the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PI paragraph is true and correct.	ERJURY under the	laws of the S	tate of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and o	fficial seal.	I NIVAL	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expres Mcy 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF	_) ss.)	•
satisfactory evidence-to be the per acknowledged to me that he/she/tl	son(s) whose name hey executed the sa n the instrument th	(s) is/are subsc nme in his/her/f	_, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of cribed to the within instrument and their authorized capacity(ies), and the entity upon behalf of which the
	•	laws of the St	tate of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and or	fficial seal.		
Notary Public			(Seal)

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TOI	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING S	TAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL	DATE
REZONING FIL	ENLIMBED	PLAN	BY
nezoning fil	ENOMBER		
	er TO	D BE COMPLETED BY APPLICA (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	NT company of the second secon
	ROPERTYBEING		Car shall a
PROTESTED	109	\$1 Normanly Dri	<u>ve Campbell, C</u>
ASSESSOR'S P	ARCELNUMBER(S)	1402008	
REASONOFP		1404000	the state of the s
		ause See Attachment A	
piotestino	proposed rozoning book		
 ·			
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
The propert	ı in which Lown an undiv	vided interest of at least 51%, and on beh	alf of which this protest is being filed,
is situated a	t: (describe property b)	y address and Assessor's Parcel Numb	er)
	1081 N	lormandy Drive	
	Camps	211, (A 9500	X
	414	1-02-008	
and is now	zoned R1-8	District. (in San	ta Clara County)
The undivid	ed interest which I own in	n the property described in the statement	above is a:
120	Fee Interest (ownership))	
<u>7₹</u>	•	ch expires on	
			•

X

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

PRINTNAME Ky Grant	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 408-838-4187
ADDRESS 100 1 St. A. O. CIT	mpbell CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE 9/25/10
PRINTNAME Kristen Grant	DAYTIME 408-398-9119 TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS 1081 Normandy Drive Cr	TY Campbell CA 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Sum Human	DATE 25/2010
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME / / TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CIT	ITY STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CI	TTY STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CI	ITY STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CF	TTY STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
Use separate sheet if ne	ecessary

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Soula Olara) ss.
on Sep 25, 2010 before me, West Mondon Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Sanda Clara ss.)
On Story Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

Notary Public

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO E	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	a finalest (film) in the finalest (film) and the second se	
FILE NUMBER	<u> </u>		COUNCIL DISTRICT	333	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
REZONING FILE NUM	BER	7 to 5 t		BY	
	TO		ED BY APPLICANT		
ADDRESS OF PROPEI		. 1. 1.	Part and the second	MANAGE TO SERVICE OF THE SERVICE OF	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL		ad her			
HIY-02-0 REASONOFPROTEST		Matteria		2.00	
I protest the propos	sed rezoning becau	Jse See Attach	ment A		
			heet if necessary		
The property in whi	ich I own an undivid cribe property by	ded interest of at le address and Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of vessor's Parcel Number)	which this protest is being filed,	
	1100 NO	rmandy			
	414-02-	060			
	D 1 0		2' G . (1	~ ~	
and is now zoned	<u>K1-8</u>		_ District. (in Santa Cl	ara County)	
The undivided inter	est which I own in t	the property descri	bed in the statement above	e is a:	
Fee Int	Fee Interest (ownership)				
Leaset	Leasehold interest which expires on				
Other:	Other: (explain)				
 	VALUE - US				

DDINTNAME	154	VTIME .	
PRINTNAME Harrison Penn Hahn	TE	AYTIME ELEPHONE#(408)	371-9032
ADDRESS	CITY , ,	STATE Ca.	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	Campbell	DATE,	<u> </u>
Darison Pen	9hhh	9/2	2/10
PRINTNAME		AYTIME ELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME		YTIME LEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME		AYTIME LEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME		YTIME LEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
PRINTNAME		YTIME LEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE	
Use separ	ate sheet if necessary		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara) ss.)
On Sept 33, 30() before me, Lund satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	e in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the law paragraph is true and correct.	ws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. We have a seal of the seal of	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss
before me,	, who proved to me on the basis of is/are subscribed to the within instrument and e in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the law paragraph is true and correct.	vs of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)
INDIALA ETUNIC	

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

en Parenner Benned fo	TO BE CO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE NUM	BER			
			ED BY APPLICANT RINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPE PROTESTED //	rtybeing L NOMAN	OB Q		
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S) 4402009	0 0	,	
REASONOFPROTES				
I protest the propos	sed rezoning becauseS	See Attach	ment A	
<u></u>				
***	U	se separate s	heet if necessary	
is situated at: (des	cribe property by addre	ss and Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of whi	·
1116 No	mmany Da	Cci	flell (90	5008
1116 Normany on Conflet (95008				
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
The undivided inte	rest which I own in the pro	operty descr	ibed in the statement above is	a:
Fee In	terest (ownership)			
Leasehold interest which expires on				
Other: (explain)				
	4.1.11.4.4.4.4.4.4			

PRINTNAME Mark Rotondo		40) 593-4947
ADDRESS 116 Normandy De Consteal	1 C1	TATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE 9-22-10
PRINTNAME NOTONDE	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS CITY and Do Car	N E	TATE ZIPCOBE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		PATE -22-10
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS CITY		TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	-	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS CITY	S	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	_	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS CITY		TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS CITY	S	TATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE
Use separate sheet if neces	sary	

STATE OF CALIFOR	NIA)	
COUNTY OF	1A CLAMP)	SS.
acknowledged to me	to be the person(s) whose that he/she/they executed ignature(s) on the instrum	name(s) is/a the same in l	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of subscribed to the within instrument and his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and on(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENA paragraph is true and		er the laws o	of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my	hand and official seal.		M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Brokes May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFOR)	SS.
COUNTY OF)	•
satisfactory evidence-t acknowledged to me t	to be the person(s) whose that he/she/they executed gnature(s) on the instrum	name(s) is/ar the same in I	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of re subscribed to the within instrument and his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and on(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
•	ALTY OF PERJURY unde	r the laws o	f the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my	hand and official seal.		
Notar	y Public		(Seal)
1,0141	,		

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE C	OMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER		Lonveni	COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY
REZONING FILE	NUMBER			- D1
	TO BE		ED BY APPLICANT	
ADDETCO OF DD	ODEDT/DEING	(PLEASE PR	INTORTYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROTESTED	123 NORMA	WOY 1	OR CAMPBELL	CA. 95008
ASSESSOR'S PAF	ICELNUMBER(S)		414 - 02-	
REASONOFPRO	TEST	<u> </u>		
I protest the pr	onoséd rezonina beceuse.	See Attach	ment A	
i protest the pr	oposou lozolililg booddoo.			
	- 1001		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	MAN DE LE CONTRACTOR DE LA CONTRACTOR DE	Use separate s	heet if necessary	
The property in its situated at: (n which I own an undivided (describe property by add	interest of at le	ast 51%, and on behalf of wh ssor's Parcel Number)	aich this protest is being file
				, CA. 95008
	,		CAMPBELL 414-02-	011
-	D1 0			
and is now zo	ned <u>R1-8</u>	 	_ District. (in Santa Cla	ra County)
			District. (in Santa Clar bed in the statement above i	
The undivided				
The undivided	interest which I own in the	property descri	bed in the statement above i	
The undivided	interest which I own in the	property descri	bed in the statement above i	

PRINTNAME		DAYTIME	UNGELI NUGU				
ADDRESS ADDRESS	CITY		408561 0494 TATE ZIPCODE				
WILLIAM ALLEN ROS ADDRESS 1123 NORMANDY DRIVE. SIGNATURE (Notarized) William A: Hiss	CAMPB	ELL CA					
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE				
Willin a. Kros			9/2///0				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#					
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE ZIPCODE				
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#					
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE ZIP CODE				
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		-	DATE				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#					
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE ZIPCODE				
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#					
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE ZIPCODE				
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE				
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#					
ADDRESS	СПҮ		TATE ZIPCODE				
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE				
Use separate sheet if necessary							

STATE OF CALIFOR	NIA)		
COUNTY OF GAM	à CLMA) ss.)		
acknowledged to me	that he/she/they exectignature(s) on the ins	uted the same	in his/her/th	Notary Public, personally a o proved to me on the basis bed to the within instrumen eir authorized capacity(ies), ne entity upon behalf of whi	and
I certify under PENA paragraph is true and		under the law	vs of the Stat	e of California that the for	egoing
July 1	hand and official sea	ıl. —		M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Expres May 22, 2012 (Seal)	NNAT BARRY
STATE OF CALIFORI	AIV)		
COUNTY OF) ss.)		
Onsatisfactory evidence-t	o be the person(s) wh	nose name(s) is	, who	Notary Public, personally ap o proved to me on the basis sed to the within instrument	of and
acknowledged to me t that by his/her/their si person(s) acted, execu	gnature(s) on the inst	ited the same : rument the pe	in his/her/the erson(s), or th	eir authorized capacity(ies), e entity upon behalf of whic	and ch the
I certify under PENA paragraph is true and		under the law	s of the Stat	e of California that the for	egoing
WITNESS my	hand and official sea	1,			
Notar	y Public	_		(Seal)	

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).